

2/22/72

Dear Jim,

The lingering effects of almost chopping my thumb off impel me to type as little as possible and to intersperse it with other work that is not jarring to that hand, so my response to your 2/18 will have to be brief. I have completed the Placement Bureau form and will mail it with this this p.m. You would blush. Urley to Lattimer excellent. If, as I now know he will if he answers and is honest, he says he has no source for the political quote, that this just represents his view, and if it is appropriate to his representation of it, you might follow by asking if he has or can ~~you~~ refer you to sample of the literature or information that serve as his sources. You address Ruby in this respect very well. I hope he addresses it...Studies ~~should~~ be your first priorities. No apologies...I had no idea you missed the Pattimer story. It is hokum. If what you saw is other than AP or NYTimes copy, I might be interested in seeing it. I.e., did the paper have its own correspondent write the story they carried? Some of these have contained tidbits not in the 'Knew' or AP's stories, little things that help round the picture out...One immediate purpose served by the thing is to show that there is little residual interest, deep second-thought skepticism or both. More was to have followed, to my knowledge, and hasn't. At least, not yet. I now think it has been aborted. ...The GSA-family agreement only enables approved pathologists and those in related fields of science or technology to see the stuff. It does not require it. This make letting anyone see it exceptional, in the lack of interest or public demand, and even more extraordinary, the granting of access to the one applicant totally without qualification under that contract (which I happen to think is largely illegal). I'd like to see what the DDCI wrote you on this. Nichols was one of the applicants. I do not know the status of his suit, ~~now~~ but it is as zany as he is....No word on Ray's criminal appeal. Delay exceptional. Wonder if Roush and inaccurate piece in current Esquire has any relationship? His civil thing was turned down by the Supreme Court today. I was just told by a reporter, who read it off the UPI wire...No immediate prospects any travel...Was unaware of the two Supreme Court moves re Shaw....Garrison failed to quit when he was ahead on the perjury charge, a mistake. I know Shaw's lawyers are serious, and I think they also will make a serious mistake to take this case to trial if they win in SC, unless they have objectives other than recovery damages. They may well ruin Shaw in the process...Was at the Del-Nex commercialization when I was there. The record is valueless save for a significant thing everyone has missed, quote from 'in Chamay. Original tapes all gone. Tried to locate. Ian who had is dead. I have the record, gift of Gordon McLendon, who owns the record and the station (Ruby's favorite, KLIF). I think there is nothing of actual value at that display. ...NBC put out two books, one with pix, one without. The second, if I am not mistaken, has the full text of all they aired. That could be very interesting. I have a borrowed copy of the other...Hope you make it into law school. Good decision, probably pleasing to family, too. Thanks, and sorry for haste. Sincerely,